

Copyright is owned by the Author of the thesis. Permission is given for a copy to be downloaded by an individual for the purpose of research and private study only. The thesis may not be reproduced elsewhere without the permission of the Author.

**An examination of Hellison's (2003) Teaching Personal and Social
Responsibility model, its validity and effectiveness for primary
school aged children in New Zealand.**

A thesis in partial fulfilment of the requirements for the degree of

Doctor of Philosophy

in

Psychology

At Massey University, Albany,

New Zealand.

Michael Hayes Smith

2014

COPYRIGHT NOTICE

Copyright resides with the author, and is governed by the Copyright Act 1994.

**No permission, or provision, is given in any manner for the sharing, copying,
or transmitting of this document either in part or in its entirety.**

Abstract

The Hellison (2003) model was developed with a goal to enable any participant in its application to develop their personal and social responsibility. The literature demonstrates that the model has been typically made available for youth, as an after-school programme option, in which participation is voluntary.

This thesis examined a longitudinal intervention over one scholastic year of an application of Hellison's (2003) model as part of the curriculum in a New Zealand primary school. Within the model, the five levels of personal and social responsibility, 1) *Respect*, 2) *Participation*, 3) *Self-direction*, 4) *Caring*, and 5) *Outside the training venue*, are already translated into five operationalised goals; 1) *Self-control and respect*, 2) *Self-motivation*, 3) *On-task independence*, 4) *Sensitivity and responsiveness*, and 5) *Trying these ideas in other areas of life*. The intervention, a forty week training programme using a ten lesson plan format, repeated four times, utilised the goal structure of the model to formulate the individual lesson plans. The lesson plans, to convey the five social goals of the model in accordance with Hellison's (2003) guidelines, included a karate skill set as the physical activity component of the training sessions. Two cohorts were recruited into the study, from two scholastically equivalent schools, one to receive the intervention ($n = 36$), and one to act as control ($n = 49$). The control group completed the measures only and did not receive the intervention.

Each goal of the model was empirically assessed to determine change over time whilst participating in the current application of the model. A time series empirical approach was used and psychometrically reliable and valid instruments were

administered at six equal-distant intervals. At each of the six intervals, four self-reporting measures were completed by the child participants. *Rosenberg's Self-Efficacy Scale (S-ES)*, *Dishman's Self-Motivation Inventory for Children (SMI-C9)*, *Muris's Self-Efficacy Questionnaire for Children (SEQ-C)*, and *Caprara and Pastorelli's Prosocial Behavior Scale*. A separate measure, *Polit's Positive Behavior Scale*, was completed each by the participant's parent, and the participant's class teacher, at each of the six intervals.

Statistical analysis using regression model fitting on the data obtained from the empirical measures demonstrated that scores increased for the intervention participants on each measure over the course of the current study. A linear model was evident from the analysis. Multivariate repeated analysis of the four child self-reporting measures demonstrated that the mean positive change, on goals 1 - 4, was greatest for the intervention group. Equality of means analysis also confirmed that the intervention group had the highest level of improvement in positive behaviour, as reported by the parents and teachers, on goal 5.

Secondary analysis using Guttman (1947, 1950) scaling enabled a detailed examination of the model's stage-like progression premise. The intention of the analysis was to determine if any participant could progress through the five stages, each in succession, as the model posits that they should. Scalograms were constructed at each of the six intervals to produce a Coefficient of Reproducibility, one each for the intervention and control groups. From the twelve coefficients, a mean Coefficient of Reproducibility $\geq .90$ was acceptable evidence of temporal reliability of the scalograms in the current study.

Guttman (1950) Scalogram Analysis demonstrated that a four-item scalogram, for the child self-reporting measures, and a five-item quasi-scalogram, combining the child self-reporting measures with a mean score of the parent and teacher measure, was found in the current study. In a research first, the Teaching Personal and Social Responsibility model was demonstrated to possess stage progression in its goal structure.

Further, participants in the intervention group demonstrated that they progressed along a single continuum, one stage after another, as the Hellison (2003) model claimed. However, the goals in the current study developed in a differing order than those proposed by the Hellison (2003) model. Specifically, the stage sequence discovered was firstly goal 2) *Self-motivation*, followed by goal 3) *On-task independence*, before goal 1) *Self-control and respect*, which was third. Goal 4) *Sensitivity and responsiveness*, and 5) *Trying these ideas in other areas of life*, emerged in the sequence as the model predicted. A repeated, between groups, analysis demonstrated that a significant difference between the intervention group and control group existed from sixteen weeks and beyond.

The findings from the current study make a significant contribution to the literature. A detailed, empirical protocol, a research first of its type, was demonstrated to be reliable for the assessment of participant development whilst engaged in an application of the model. A revised Hellison (2003) model was valid, and effective, for the intervention participants as the model posits. A wider application of the Hellison model is warranted and continued research is recommended. A replication of the current study, as well as research of a school-wide application, of the revised Hellison (2003) model is suggested.

Acknowledgements

Firstly, I would like to thank the research participants that took part in this study. Conducting research centred on children is a sensitive undertaking. Without the participation of the two schools, their principals, teachers, support staff and most particularly, the students themselves, this study would not have been possible. Also to the parents of the students, a particular mention here. Without the unequivocal support from the parents of the students, equally this study could not have been conducted. In being allowed the privilege of delivering this study, I was solemnly aware that I was equally responsible for their pride and joy whilst participating, namely their children. In many respects, a collaborated effort was achieved, for which my mere thanks seem insufficient. To each of them however, your efforts sincerely appreciated, thank you.

I would like to acknowledge my supervision team who have diligently watched over my career through this study, it has been a long and challenging process. Thank you to Dr. Richard Fletcher for his ongoing commitment to my efforts, particularly in his guidance in establishing this study and keeping it focused at each step along the way. Thank you to Professor Stuart Carr whom reawakened not only my passion for learning, but most importantly reminding me the benefits of remaining objective, to 'hold everything up to the light'. To each of them both, your scholarly direction and professional expertise provided, I shall remain forever grateful. I also make a special mention to the Office of the Assistant Vice Chancellor (Māori and Pasifika), Massey University, for the Pūrehuroa Awards for which I was a most grateful recipient.

I would like to express my gratitude to Professor Don Hellison for his Teaching Personal and Social Responsibility model. I also like to thank him, Dr. Paul Wright, and Dr. David Walsh for their initial correspondence and encouragement when I was first formulating ideas about this project. I am also grateful to the Morris Rosenberg Foundation, Dr. Rod Dishman, Professor Peter Muris, Professor Gian Vittorio Caprara, and Dr. Sylvia Epps for their permissions for the use of their respective measures in the current study. From all of these sources that enabled my research, without which I could not have undertaken this work, my thanks to you all.

Last but certainly not least, I must thank my family who have provided their support and assistance over these years of my career. To my mother Kaye, my eternal gratitude, who has lived alongside this study, every step of the way. To my father David, a retired police officer who sadly passed away during this time, thank you most especially for all the esoteric discussions that influenced my thinking around child welfare and crime prevention. It will be my hope that I continue to be the person they have always hoped me to be. I also take this opportunity to thank the many friends and extended family who have given their ongoing understanding and support, despite my prolonged absence from their lives. Finally to Katie, if ever any one individual has invested so much for so little, I look forward to now being able to return her kindness, love, and support.

Table of Contents

Abstract	ii
Acknowledgements	vi
Table of Contents	viii
List of Tables	xv
List of Figures	xviii

Chapter One:

Thesis Question and Critical Literature Review	1
Thesis Question	1
‘ <u>How</u> ’ does the model predict that a child will become progressively more personally and socially responsible?	2
Details of the five levels in the model	4
From levels to goals	5
Context and the Teaching Personal and Social Responsibility model	11
Country	11
Socioeconomic	11
Beyond sport	13
Beyond school	15
Age	15

The evolution of physical education, and an opportunity for the current study	16
Research evidence on the Hellison (2003) model	17
Steps versus Curves: A theoretical reappraisal of the Hellison (2003) model	25
A role for stage change and the development of personal and social responsibility	28
An argument for maturational change and the development of personal and social responsibility	32
An acid test for choosing between Figures 1, 2, and 3.	33
Summary	35
Hypotheses	36
Chapter Two:	
Methodology	37
Participants and environment	37
Recruitment	39
Procedure	40
The Lesson Plan	41

Activities as the basis of the Lesson Plan	43
Matching the Lesson Plan to the Teaching Personal and Social Responsibility model	47
Overview of a typical lesson in the current study	49
The final activity session of the current study	52
Measures used in the current study	53
Rosenberg's Self-Esteem Scale (S-ES)	54
Dishman's Self-Motivation Inventory for Children (SMI-C9)	55
Muris's Self-Efficacy Questionnaire for Children (SEQ-C)	57
Caprara's Prosocial Behaviour Scale (PBS)	59
Positive Behavior Scale (Parent and Teacher versions)	61
Data collection and administration	63
Study timelines	65
Data analysis and rational	67
Statistical measurement of individual change over time	68

Statistical measurement of group change over time	71
The application of Guttman scaling in the current study	72
Chapter Three:	
Preliminary Results	73
Reliability analysis	74
Determination of Variance in the data	78
Assessing the variance in the child measures	78
Results from the control group on the child measures	80
Results from the intervention group on the child measures	81
Overview of the child measures	88
Assessing the variance from the Positive Behavior Scale – parent and teacher measure	90
Assessment of the Positive Behavior Scale by teachers (PBS (T))	91
Results from the control group on the teachers measure	91
Results from the intervention group on the teachers measure	92

Assessment of the Positive Behavior Scale by parents (PBS (P))	93
Results from the control group on the parents measure	93
Results from the intervention group on the parents measure	94
Variety of trajectories in the Positive Behavior Scale	95
Overview of the Positive Behavior Scale - parent and teacher measure	102
Comparisons between the teacher and parent results	106
Preliminary correlation analysis of all measures in the current study	108
Chapter Four:	
Statistical analysis: Child, parent and teacher measures	115
Multivariate repeated measures (child measures)	115
Independent <i>t</i> -tests (parent and teacher measure)	123
Chapter Five:	
Guttman Scalograms: Construction and Analysis	126
Was there a scalogram?	126
Did the participants in the Intervention group, but not in the Control, climb up the scalogram over time?	136

Future Directions	169
Conclusion	170
References	173
Appendices	181
Appendix A: Teacher Information Sheet	
Appendix B: Teacher Consent Form	
Appendix C: Child Participant Information Sheet	
Appendix D: Child Participant Consent	
Appendix E: Parent Participant Information Sheet	
Appendix F: Parent Participant Consent	
Appendix G: Teacher Confidentiality Agreement	
Appendix H: Karate Authorisation	
Appendix I: Session Plans	
Appendix J: Individual fitted OLS trajectories	
Appendix K: OLS Regressions	
Appendix L: Scalograms	

List of Tables

Table 1: Hellison's Teaching Personal and Social Responsibility levels as Goals.

Table 2: Summarised research conducted on the Teaching Personal and Social Responsibility (2003) model.

Table 3: Demographic characteristics of participants.

Table 4: Mapping the lesson plan to the goals of the Hellison (2003) model.

Table 5: Measures used to assess the constructs of the responsibility goals.

Table 6: Testing protocol.

Table 7: Timelines of the current study:

Intervention and test administration timeline.

Session plan timeline.

Table 8: Means and Standard Deviations (SD) for all child self-reporting measures (including subscales) for control and intervention groups.

Table 9: Means and Standard Deviations (SD) for the Positive Behavior Scale (teachers(T) and parents(P) by subscale) for control and intervention groups.

Table 10: Reliability analysis of all measures (including subscales) calculated with Cronbach's alpha.

Table 11: Control correlations for the Positive Behavior Scale between teachers and parents (Initial Estimates and Rates of Change).

Table 12: Control correlations between child self-reporting measures
(Initial Estimates and Rates of Change).

Table 13: Intervention correlations for the Positive Behavior Scale between parents
and teachers (Initial Estimates and Rates of Change).

Table 14: Intervention correlations between child self-reporting measures
(Initial Estimates and Rates of Change).

Table 15: Multivariate tests using Pillai's Trace.

Table 16: Estimated marginal means by Group.

Table 17: Estimated marginal means by Time.

Table 18: Mean change difference between Time points.

Table 19: Coefficients of Reproducibility for all measures – control ($n=49$) and
intervention groups ($n=36$).

Table 20: Between groups comparison, rates of progress at all time points,
goals 1 - 4.

Table 21: Between groups comparison, rates of progress at all time points,
goals 1 - 5.

Table 22: Control results from exploratory OLS regression models for the PBS,
SMI-C9, and S-ES measures.

Table 23: Control results from exploratory OLS regression models for the SEQ-C
subscales.

Table 24: Control results from exploratory OLS regression models for the PBS(T)
subscales.

Table 25: Control results from exploratory OLS regression models for the PBS(P) subscales.

Table 26: Intervention results from exploratory OLS regression models for PBS, SMI-C9, and S-ES measures.

Table 27: Intervention results from exploratory OLS regression models for the SEQ-C subscales.

Table 28: Intervention results from exploratory OLS regression models for the PBS(T) subscales.

Table 29: Intervention results from exploratory OLS regression models for the PBS(P) subscales.

List of Figures

Figure 1: A model of 'How' Hellison's model should work.

Figure 2: A schemata of independently developing personal and social responsibility skills of varying difficulty.

Figure 3: A schemata of concurrently developing personal and social responsibility skills of equal difficulty.

Figure 4: An exemplar of the lesson plan for Respect.

Figure 5: Control OLS trajectories for the S-ES measure.

Figure 6: Intervention OLS trajectories for the S-ES measure.

Figure 7: Control OLS trajectories for the SMI-C9 measure.

Figure 8: Intervention OLS trajectories for the SMI-C9 measure.

Figure 9: Control OLS trajectories for the SEQ-C (A subscale) measure.

Figure 10: Intervention OLS trajectories for the SEQ-C (A subscale) measure.

Figure 11: Control OLS trajectories for the SEQ-C (S subscale) measure.

Figure 12: Intervention OLS trajectories for the SEQ-C (S subscale) measure.

Figure 13: Control OLS trajectories for the SEQ-C (E subscale) measure.

Figure 14: Intervention OLS trajectories for the SEQ-C (E subscale) measure.

Figure 15: Control OLS trajectories for the PBS measure.

Figure 16: Intervention OLS trajectories for the PBS measure.

Figure 17: Standardised OLS mean trajectories by measure - Control group.

Figure 18: Standardised OLS mean trajectories by measure - Intervention Group.

Figure 19: Control OLS trajectories for the Positive Behavior Scale (T)
(subscale SC).

Figure 20: Intervention OLS trajectories for the Positive Behavior Scale (T)
(subscale SC).

Figure 21: Control OLS trajectories for the Positive Behavior Scale (T)
(subscale A).

Figure 22: Intervention OLS trajectories for the Positive Behavior Scale (T)
(subscale A).

Figure 23: Control OLS trajectories for the Positive Behavior Scale (T)
(subscale C).

Figure 24: Intervention OLS trajectories for the Positive Behavior Scale (T)
(subscale C).

Figure 25: Control OLS trajectories for the Positive Behavior Scale (P)
(subscale SC).

Figure 26: Intervention OLS trajectories for the Positive Behavior Scale (P)
(subscale SC).

Figure 27: Control OLS trajectories for the Positive Behavior Scale (P)
(subscale A).

Figure 28: Intervention OLS trajectories for the Positive Behavior Scale (P)
(subscale A).

Figure 29: Control OLS trajectories for the Positive Behavior Scale (P)
(subscale C).

Figure 30: Intervention OLS trajectories for the Positive Behavior Scale (P)
(subscale C).

Figure 31: Teachers standardised OLS mean trajectories by subscale –
Control group.

Figure 32: Teachers standardised OLS mean trajectories by subscale –
Intervention group.

Figure 33: Parents standardised OLS mean trajectories by subscale –
Control group.

Figure 34: Parents standardised OLS mean trajectories by subscale –
Intervention group.

Figure 35: Estimated Marginal Means of self-esteem by group.

Figure 36: Estimated Marginal Means of self-motivation by group.

Figure 37: Estimated Marginal Means of self-efficacy by group.

Figure 38: Estimated Marginal Means of prosocial behaviour by group.

Figure 39: Group Statistics and Independent Samples Test for the Positive
Behaviour Scale (PBS) completed by teachers (T).

Figure 40: Group Statistics and Independent Samples Test for the Positive
Behaviour Scale (PBS) completed by parents (P).

Figure 41: Control scalograms: Child measures – Time 1 and Time 2.

Figure 42: Control scalograms: Child measures – Time 3 and Time 4.

Figure 43: Control scalograms: Child measures – Time 5 and Time 6.

Figure 44: Intervention scalograms: Child measures – Time 1 and Time 2.

Figure 45: Intervention scalograms: Child measures – Time 3 and Time 4.

Figure 46: Intervention scalograms: Child measures – Time 5 and Time 6.

Figure 47: Control teacher / parent scalograms - Time 1 and Time 2.

Figure 48: Control teacher / parent scalograms - Time 3 and Time 4.

Figure 49: Control teacher / parent scalograms - Time 5 and Time 6.

Figure 50: Intervention teacher / parent scalograms - Time 1 and Time 2.

Figure 51: Intervention teacher / parent scalograms - Time 3 and Time 4.

Figure 52: Intervention teacher / parent scalograms - Time 5 and Time 6.

Figure 53: A representation of a perfect Guttman scale for the current study,
according to the Hellison (2003) model.

Figure 54: Rearranging the columns according to Guttman (1950) – Intervention
group at Time 1.

Figure 55: Counting errors (rearranging the rows according to Guttman (1950)) –
Intervention group at Time 1.

Figure 56: Mean scale scores as a function of time and treatment group –
Goals 1 - 4 only.

Figure 57: Quasi-scalogram by treatment group – Goals 1 - 5.